

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. 10/034,073 12/28/2001 Tetsuya Nagano NGB-12833 2231 40854 7590 07/07/2004 **EXAMINER** RANKIN, HILL, PORTER & CLARK LLP LONEY, DONALD J **4080 ERIE STREET** ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER WILLOUGHBY, OH 44094-7836 1772

DATE MAILED: 07/07/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action	Application No.	Applicant(s)	1
	10/034,073	NAGANO ET AL.	v
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Donald Loney	1772	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the d	correspondence address	
THE REPLY FILED FAILS TO PLACE THIS API Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appe Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	 a timely filed amendment whi 	cation. A proper reply to chiplaces the application	in
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of			
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ad event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	nan SIX MONTHS from the mailing date o	f the final rejection.	
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The data have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exter 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortene (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three meanned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	nsion and the corresponding amount of the d statutory period for reply originally set in	e fee. The appropriate extension the final Office action; or (2) as s	fee under set forth in
 A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF 			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered to	pecause:		
(a) \square they raise new issues that would require furth	ner consideration and/or search	(see NOTE below);	
(b) \square they raise the issue of new matter (see Note	below);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by ma	terially reducing or simplit	fying the
(d) they present additional claims without cance	ling a corresponding number of	finally rejected claims.	
NOTE:			
$3.\square$ Applicant's reply has overcome the following reje	ction(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	d be allowable if submitted in a s	separate, timely filed ame	endment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: S		sidered but does NOT pla	ice the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were new	wly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendmen explanation of how the new or amended claims w			ın
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows	:		
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) ap	proved or b)□ disapproved by	the Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	ent(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).		
10. Other:		In I ha	
	,	Donald Loney Primary Examiner Art Unit: 1772	

Application No.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The broadest reasonable interpretation of the structure of the claims has been shown in the prior art. The applicant argues that the references only show figures that are schematic in nature and can not be taken literally, however, these figures alone read upon the structure of the instant claims. The applicant also argues that a square wave or trapezoidal wave would not be considered a half saw tooth, however, given its broadest interpretation any truncated or half cut off square, trapezoid, rectangle (positioned vertically and half cut off as shown by the square wave) or triangle can be considered half saw tooth. The instant claims fail to structurally define over the prior art. Saw teeth can come in a variety of different shapes of which the applicant has not distinguished over the prior art with the limitation half-saw tooth.